

IBS

VOLUME 5

JULY 1983



IRISH
BIBLICAL
STUDIES

1-4 1983
LIBRARY

1962

Editor: Rev. Professor E.A. Russell
Union Theological College
Belfast BT7 1JT, N. Ireland

Associate Editor: Professor Ernest Best, The University
Glasgow, G12 8QQ

Assistant Editor: Miss Anne McConnell
Union Theological College

Editorial Advisory Panel

Professor D.W. Gooding, Queen's University, Belfast
Rev Dr David Hill, The University, Sheffield.
Principal R.J. McKelvey, The Congregational College
Whalley Range, Manchester M16 8BP
Rev Professor J.S. McIvor, Union Theological College
Rev J. Murphy-O'Connor, L'Ecole Biblique, Jerusalem
Rev J.S. McPolin, S.J., Milltown Park, Dublin 6.
Professor E. Nicholson, Oriel College, Oxford
Rev. V. Parkin, Edgehill College, Belfast
Mr David Payne, Queen's University, Belfast.
Professor Jacob Weingreen, Trinity College, Dublin

Subscriptions

All subscriptions should be made payable to "Irish
Biblical Studies" (not to individuals) and addressed
to the Assistant Editor

Subscription for 1983 (inclusive of postage):

Individuals £5.75 Sterling or 7 Irish pounds

Institutions £8 Sterling; US\$ 14.50

Design on cover by Rev Aylmer Armstrong, the
Presbyterian Manse, Moneydig, Co. Antrim

Contents

erence McCaughey, Conscience and Decision-Making in
some Early Christian Communities 115-131

ale C. Allison Jr., Psalm 23(22) in Early
Christianity: A Suggestion 132-137

ennis Brown, Saint Jerome as a Biblical Exegete 138-155

Reviews: P.D. Miller, Sin and Judgment in the Prophets:
a stylistic and theological analysis (D.F. Payne);
Fernando F. Segovia, Love Relationships in the
Johannine Tradition (J.S. McPolin);
Jane Schaberg, The Father, the Son and the Holy
Spirit: The Triadic Phrase in Matthew 28.19b
(D. Hill); B.H. Brinsmead, Galatians -
Dialogical Response to Opponents (E.A. Russell);
Karl Rahner, Concern for the Church (J. Thompson);
A History of Congregations in the Presbyterian
Church in Ireland 1610-1682 (R.B. Knox) 156-169

Terence McCaughey, Conscience and Decision-Making in some
Early Christian Communities

When we turn to the dictionaries and word books, we find that the word *συνείδησις* is one of the few words the early Christians used which does not bear connotational resonances from its having been used in the LXX. /1 A cognate term *σύνεσις* does occur fairly frequently in the LXX with the meaning "understanding" - a meaning which *συνείδησις* often has in the NT as we will be noting.

One thing is clear however. The early Christians did invent the term. They found it in popular usage and made use of it. /2 Scholars are pretty well agreed that it had once been a technical term in the philosophical schools - like many of the words we use - but had ceased to be so and was by Paul's time being used fairly loosely and with varied meaning. Paul is the first writer in the NT to use it, though it seems likely that he is picking up a term which had already been employed in the Corinthian community's letters to him. /3

A close study of Paul's usage reveals that *συνείδησις* often means "consciousness/awareness" - in this respect very like the cognate *σύνεσις* in the LXX - rather than what modern English means by "conscience".

In fact the apostle Paul is in no way to be hailed as a hero of the introspective conscience. When he wrote, "I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want is what I do" (Rom 7.19), he is not giving expression to what C.G. Jung called the "individuation Process". /4 Nor is he in line with the tradition of mediaeval piety which has its roots in Augustine and its most familiar expression in the anguish of that Augustinian professor of Scripture, Martin Luther. That tradition of interpretation of Acts which pictures him, racked with doubts, finally falling to the ground in repentance on the Damascus road is not corroborated by his own writings. What he says himself argues for a "robust" conscience - as "touching the law, blameless" (Phil 3.6).

It has been suggested that Paul's so-called "doctrine" of justification arises out of a prior question concerning the role of Israel and of the Torah in the light of God's perceived universal call to the whole race in and through Jesus Christ. /5 Rpmans 7 could be said to be Paul's third attempt in the extant epistolary literature to grapple with this question.

That it most often means "awareness/consciousness" becomes clear when one considers the individual occurrences in context.

1. 2 Corinthians 4.1-6: "commending ourselves to the awareness of men in the sight of/face of God"

In this passage Paul is commending his own participation in the ministry of the New Covenant. He has begun by repudiating any sort of self-commendation - the Corinthians are themselves his "letter of commendation" (2 Cor 3.2-3). The ministry which Paul and his associates exercise is one which comes into being sola gratia (2 Cor 4.1). Renouncing any kind of occultism he has not modified the scandal inherent in the Gospel (v2a) and now commends himself to people's awareness and perception "in the sight of God", i.e. their awareness of how things may appear to God and therefore ultimately are. In vv4-5 he goes on to show how lack of awareness of the Gospel is the work of Satan who "blinds" the "minds" of unbelievers so that they do not perceive in Jesus Christ any good news or gospel at all - much less do they see him as the very "image (εἰκὼν) of God" (v4). The glory referred to in v4 is not that of Christ's ministers. It is God's glory shining in the face of Jesus Christ (v6) and illuminating the character and conduct of the apostles with the light of the new creation, to the end that many others may come to a knowledge of God's glory.

In this passage then Paul appeals to the readers' experience of himself and others as evidence of God's work in them - "in the sight of God we commend ourselves to your awareness" (of how things really and ultimately are).

B. 2 Corinthians 5. 11-21

"What we are", he says in v11, "is known to God" (i.e. finally and fully only to God), "and I hope it is also known to your conscience" (i.e. to your awareness of what we really are).....that is, "ambassadors of Christ" (v20) i.e. the ones through whom God is making his appeal. This is not what the sickly little apostle necessarily appeared to be on all occasions. That is why he urges them to consider that the grace of God is so great that he can take even us as we are and make us apostles.

Indeed from now on we do not estimate anyone merely from the human point of view (v16). How dangerous it is to do so must surely be clear to those who at one point dismissed Jesus himself by estimating him only from the human point of view, he suggests (v16b). Now, however, perceive that in the life and death of Jesus God was all time at work, reconciling the world to himself. Those who have this awareness of what is really happening recognize new Creation as wonderful as the first one, in which God taking the despised and the weak, the "nothings" of the world, and making them something. It is to their perception/consciousness of this that Paul is appealing.

C. 1 Corinthians 4. 1-7

In this passage the denominative verb $\sigma\upsilon\nu\omicron\iota\delta\alpha$ is used to refer to knowledge of "the moral quality of the subject's own acts and character." /6 Paul says (v4): "I am not aware of anything (against myself)"....the $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ element in $\sigma\upsilon\nu\omicron\iota\delta\alpha$ (cf con-scientia) implies an original indication in the word of shared awareness. So in v4 Paul is speaking of guilty knowledge about himself, knowledge he has about himself which would witness to him against himself, but which he claims here not to have. In fact it turns out that, just as in popular usage, so also in Paul, the "consciousness/awareness" is narrowed down on occasion to mean consciousness of incongruity, or even guilt - my awareness that my acts and/or character do not tally with things-as-they-really-are.

This would seem to be the semantic significance of

Romans 13.5 where the apostle who has just fitted the rulers of this world into the divine order of things (13.4) proceeds to advise his readers to be subject to them - not alone in order to avoid "the wrath of God" but also "for conscience sake" (οὐ μόνον διὰ τὴν ὀργὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν, 13.5). The consciousness in other words has developed a negative aspect: it shows to what I am not and how I have transgressed the basic pattern of the created order.

But συνείδησις/σύνοιδα have also a much more positive aspect for Paul than Pierce will generally allow. The consciousness under discussion here has two characteristics:-

- a) it gives us a sense of obligation, and
- b) it gives this to all people, even to the Gentiles who have no knowledge of the Torah and who have never come to faith.

At Romans 2.14ff Paul speaks of the Gentiles in these terms:

"When Gentiles who do not have the law do by nature what the law requires, they are a law to themselves, even though they do not have the law (Torah). They show that they have the law written on their hearts (in their intentionality) while their "conscience" (RSV) also bears witness, and their conflicting thoughts accuse or perhaps excuse them on that Day when, according to my gospel, God judges the secrets of men by Christ Jesus."

number of points are to be noted in this passage.

First, that "conscience" here again means an awareness of how things ought to be, a perception which is practical rather than speculative in its outworking. It seems clear that Paul is intending to say that some Gentiles day from time to time both perceive and actually perform what can properly be said to be the Will of God. He does not intend to give the impression that by force of what centuries later came to be called "Natural Theology"

the Gentiles in general have come to "that obedience which faith is" (Rom 1.5, English translation of Bultmann's phrase). He has already made that abundantly clear in Romans 1.18-23, a passage which, it has been suggested /8, may be borrowed and/or adapted from a synagogue sermon. In that passage (Rom 1.20c-21) he says emphatically that the Gentiles are "without excuse; for although they 'knew' God they did not honour him as Godand their senseless minds were darkened.....etc."

Secondly, it would appear from this passage that the "conscience/ awareness" of the Gentiles leads them to an inarticulate and sporadic obedience, but in its positive aspect it proves unreliable. Left to themselves they are not capable of obedience - as a group whatever about individuals. The irony for Paul lies in the fact that neither are the Jews - even though they were the recipients of Covenant and Torah, whatever about individuals like Abraham whose faithful obedience predates both.

Paul's main concern in Romans, as elsewhere in his epistles is, however, with the "conscience/consciousness" of groups and, in particular, with those Christian communities he had helped to found and continued affectionately to fear for and to love. The conscience of these groups and their perception of how things are and ultimately must be is given shape and form through commitment to what the community takes to be the significance of Jesus. Consciousness of the realm of grace now forms the context of any specifically Christian action and behaviour.

It is no surprise then to find that mention of *συνείδησις* is commonly made in the context of eschatological hope. It will be on "that day when, according to my gospel, God judges the secrets of men by Christ Jesus", that the witness of conscience will be tested and proved (Rom 2.15-16)

E. At Romans 9.1 Paul speaks of his "conscience bearing witness in the Holy Spirit". This phrase parallels the immediately preceding phrase, "I am

speaking the truth in Christ" thus:

- (a) I am speaking the truth in Christ, I am not lying;
- (b) my conscience bears me witness in the Holy Spirit.....

and the Spirit is the witness to the reality of the New Age.

.. 2 Corinthians 1.12

This eschatological dimension comes to expression here where Paul writes:

"For our 'boast' (i.e. the grounds for any 'boasting' we might conceivably engage in) is this: - the testimony (μαρτύριον) of our conscience (RSV) (i.e. the testimony of our consciousness) that we have in fact behaved in the world, and still more toward you people, with holiness and godly sincerity, not by earthly wisdom but by the grace of God. For we write you nothing that you cannot read and understand. I hope you will understand (as you have understood in part), so that you can be proud of us as we can of you on the day of the Lord Jesus."

On that day what is now veiled to Paul's readers (and to a measure to himself, 1 Cor 13.12) will be made perfectly clear. Things as they really are (including this ministry) will be seen for what they really are. The New Creation will be revealed. Meanwhile, the interim period is one of uncertainty living in Christ's present, trusting in his past, hoping for his future.

The conscience or Christian consciousness is spoken of again and again in the NT in terms of witness (μαρτύριον), witness to what is not yet or, more accurately, to that which is not yet wholly visible. In this, the operation of συνείδησις or Christian consciousness parallels the witness of the Holy Spirit whom Paul speaks of as an "earnest" (ἀρραβών) and indication, a firstfruits of the world that is to be, a confirmation of the disturbing assertion that the way to the Cross is in fact God's way. The connection between the two has already been adverted to with reference to Romans 9.1 above.

Implicit in what has just been said is the conviction

that *συνείδησις* belongs to the realm of faith rather than knowledge or sight. We do not respond adequately to its witness, but neither does it always speak with absolute clarity. Paul does not claim that sort of clarity of vision for himself or for any other Christian either - not even for their "prophecy". /9

In this connection it is worth noting that when Paul speaks in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10 about Christians eating meat offered to idols or not, he uses the word *συνείδησις*. But when he came to deal with a similar question in Romans 14, he speaks not of *συνείδησις* but of "faith".

In fact, Paul does not ever claim on behalf of Christians that their religion gives them the kind of overall knowledge or Christian answer to the deepest and most imponderable mysteries posed by our human existence. What we have been granted, he suggests (1 Cor 2.16), is something rather more valuable - the *νοῦς Χριστοῦ*, "the mind of Christ". By "mind", as Bultmann and many others have pointed out, /10 he does not mean "intelligence" or "intellectual faculties" but understanding, intelligent planning, intentionality.

This word *νοῦς* is the one he uses in Romans 1.28 where he speaks of the "lawless mind" to which God has abandoned the heathen. It is their depraved inclination. The word has much the same force in 1 Cor 1.10 and Rom 12.2 as Bultmann points out.

The will/intention/mind of God manifests itself to the Christian consciousness (which it actually forms) in the mysterious agony and abandonment of the crucified Jesus. But this is the precise element of the kerygma which the Corinthian Christians had been ignoring with disastrous results for their life together and their praxis in general.

We might turn now to two questions, the first of which is more quickly dealt with than the second:-

- (1) What status does he give to *συνείδησις* ?
- (2) Under what constraints would he consider it to be

operating?

The first can be answered by saying that he sets a very high value upon it, as is clear from 1 Cor 8 and 10. But it does operate within fairly clearly discernible constraints, as is clear from the sentence cited above (1 Cor 4.4), "I know nothing against myself....but I am not thereby justified."

Pierce is probably right (op.cit.88) in saying that Paul most often thinks of conscience as showing up the incongruous. In this function it operates negatively but cannot act positively to acquit or justify. In Rom 2.14ff he is clear that it proves inadequate in the quest for obedience. At best it appears to be provisional (Pierce, 88), - faith's consciousness/awareness in the quest for an adequate praxis in those ambiguities of human existence which Matthew represents Jesus himself as taking seriously. (Matt 12.22-28)

There is an even graver limitation set upon the individual or group conscience in Paul's view, however, and that comes to light clearly in 1 Cor 8 and 10 and at Rom 14 with reference to the propriety or otherwise of eating meat which has been ritually slaughtered.

In 1 Cor 8 the cleavage is between what he calls "knowledge" to which high-flying Christians of Corinth may claim and "love" on which they are perhaps somewhat efficient. The discussion is set under the motto, "knowledge puffs up but love builds up". The apostle then goes on to make it clear that he shares the "knowledge" of the sophisticated who recognize that if there are no such things as other gods it does not matter whether the meat has been prayed over in their temples or not. That is not in question. What is in question is the wisdom of insisting on exercise of the freedom which this knowledge affords (1 Cor 8.10)

The "weak" brother here is referred to as having what in a kind of shorthand allusive way he calls a "weak-conscience". This phrase may be the coinage of his "strong" Corinthian correspondents who no doubt

communicated by letter. /12 But however that may be, the "weak conscience" can scarcely be other than a way of describing the condition of those who have an inadequate grasp of things as they really are, or are believed by the Christian to be. Paul intends that those who are deemed to be "strong" should not (by the exercise of their strength) be the occasion of stunting the eventual growth of the less developed awareness of the "weak" into some more robust and profound.

In chapter 10 Paul asks his readers to consider what implications must be drawn on this question by those who consider that in the eucharistic meal they themselves partake of the body and blood of their Lord - a participation which bound them (diverse as they were socially, racially and culturally) into one body. He suggests that it would be consistent and prudent not even to appear to partake of the table of demons by participating in communal meals at local festivals.

In response presumably to those who have made the texts cited in 1 Cor 10.23,26 into their slogans, Paul points out that the exercise of freedom is not always helpful. Indeed it has been his delicately maintained view that the non-exercise of freedom can become the only genuine exercise of the freedom we have in Christ. This is the principle enunciated in the intervening chapter (1 Cor 9.19-23), and it is exemplified in his resistance to the circumcision of the gentile Titus (Gal 2.3-4) on the one hand and his own circumcizing of Timothy, who through his mother was technically a Jew, on the other. /13 His obedience to the counsel offered by James in Acts 21.17-26 is no doubt another example of this principle at work in practice.

While accepting Theissen's identification of who the "weak" in Corinth were, we might go on to a point he does not make. Paul's position is the paradoxical one that his weaknesses are the only boast he can have. He who shared the awareness of the "strong", nevertheless reckons with the weakness of the "weak". "To the weak I became weak, that I might win the weak....I do it all for the sake of the gospel, that I might share its

"blessings" (1 Cor 9.22-23). He does not say that to the strong he becomes strong! In 1 Cor 10 and certainly in Rom 14, there is an implied if not direct question as to just how confident one can really be in differentiating "weak" and "strong".

It is of the first importance to recognize that the point at issue in 1 Cor 8 and 10 and in Rom 14 is different in kind from that at issue between Paul and Barnabas in Gal 2. where Paul accused Barnabas and others of ὑπόκρισις (RSV, "insincerity"). This word is used to indicate the way in which Barnabas who had a well-developed consciousness of the implications of table-fellowship, under pressure proceeded to act on a less well-developed one. The essential character of the gospel is at stake in the Antioch encounter (Gal 2.11ff), and this leaves no choice in the matter. A good deal less is at stake in Corinth in the meat question - which could arise only rarely for the poorer members anyway.
7/14

C.A. Pierce is no doubt right in saying that later NT writings give the perfectly correct impression "that Paul allots only a minor place to συνέλθουσιν because the Christian, having died to sin, should be free from the pain of conscience." But that is emphatically not the whole story. The Paul who wrote to the somewhat disillusioned Galatian Christians that those who are "spiritual" should restore the one who trespassed "in a spirit of gentleness" certainly knew the realities of failure /16 and was well aware of the need for a continual refining of Christian awareness and consciousness.

This is well illustrated by the opening section of Philippians (1.9-11), in which he again sets "knowledge" (now to be refined by "discernment") under the formative and creative power of "love":-

"It is my prayer that your love may abound more and more with all knowledge (ἐν ἐπιγνώσει) and discernment (καὶ πάσῃ αἰσθήσει),⁴ so that you may approve what is excellent and may be pure and blameless for the day of Christ (cf above), filled

with the fruits of righteousness which come through Jesus Christ, to the glory and praise of God."

The Pastoral Epistles represent a change with continuing use. In them we begin to read for the first time about "a pure conscience" (καθαρά συνείδησις, 1 Tim 3.9, 2 Tim 1.3; but cf 1 Tim 1.5,19; Titus 1.15). But we are now in a world rather different from Paul's. Dibelius has been too hard in calling these letters the earliest documents of "bourgeois Christianity", but it is true that in the face of heresy, the Christian consciousness how things really will be/are gives way to "the faith once delivered to the saints", and Christian "knowledge" (γνῶσις) has achieved an altogether more propositional character. Christian "awareness" is being replaced by orthodoxy in belief and orthodoxy is to be expressed in conduct that will not reflect unfavourably upon the Church.

The position in the post-pauline churches for whom the Pastorals were written or the church to which Hebrews belong would merit treatment on their own, the latter especially in the light of the writer's ideas on atonement and "perfecting", but I would prefer to say something here about another church in the documents of which the word συνείδησις is never mentioned but which nevertheless shows certain significant characteristics in common with Pauline material, i.e. the "Community of the Beloved Disciple", as Raymond Brown has attractively named it. /17

Here we have to do with a community in which the command to love can be given again and again with eloquence and earnestness, but without (apparently) any effort such as Paul made in 1 Cor 13 and elsewhere in paraenetic passages, to give it a profile. Except for the notably isolated identification of the relation between God and the world in John 3.16 (however significant) this community's answer to the ethical problem is the one we associate mostly with the exclusive sects - a calling out of the world and into the community.

Certainly John's gospel gives vivid expression to the perception that the believing community, as it returns Christ's love, sees and recognizes what others fail to see, e.g. Mary Magdalene in the garden (20.16) or the Beloved Disciple at the grave (20.8) or, in the boat, recognizing at a distance (21.7a). Questions as to what it will mean in practice to love are not generally raised or answered (John 21.15-17 notwithstanding), except to say that whoever still fears has not yet been perfected in love (1 John 4.18). The author of 1 John is clearly aware of the continuing power of sin, even inside the Christian community. In this he appears to differ with the secessionists who, if Brown is right, had broken off from his community and had the idea that they were sinless, having moved into the New Age. He accuses them of failing to "love the brothers" (2.9-11; 3.11-18; 4.20), and love of the brothers may indeed have seemed too mundane to a group who had committed themselves (like some in Corinth?) to a wholly other-world Saviour. Brown is no doubt right in saying /18 that one of the main differences between the writer of 1 John and his opponents is "precisely that for him the earthly life of Jesus matters."

Jesus is the "first Paraclete", as is implied in his sending of another one. /19 He is identified as the Spirit of Truth and will guide them into all truth, "for he will not speak on his own authority, but whatever he hears he will speak. And he will declare to you the things that are to come....." (John 16.13f). He will "bear witness to me" (16.26). The Spirit bears witness that the Father and the Son are one, that the Father sent the Son. It is as the risen Christ bestows the Spirit in chapter 20 that he makes the disciples part of this movement within the Godhead itself.

In other words, the Paraclete will function in a way not dissimilar from Paul's *συνεῖδησις* under the Holy Spirit.

(1) He will "witness" to the significance of Jesus, and create in the community an awareness as to how things really are and as to what movement is at work in him. Every time this perception takes precedence in the minds

of believers over alternative interpretations of events, then the Prince of this world and his presuppositions are judged (16.11) and even cast out. (This is no doubt the meaning of John 12.27-32).

(2) For all that this community believed itself to be the community of the Last Time. It also lived through its trials and ordered its life in anticipation (John 16.13b) an incalculably wonderful future which is Christ's and on his.

It is worthy of note that in both pauline and johannine literature the anathemata are reserved for what we today would call dogmatic divergence, e.g. Gal 1.7-9; 20-23; 1 John 2.20-23; 4.2-3. But to have got the gospel wrong in the way Paul believes the Galatians now have or the writer of 1 John is convinced those he is referring to in this passage have, is to mistake the nature of things as they really are, and inevitably as a result the life and praxis of those who are so mistaken will be affected. That is why it is both methodologically and historically mistaken to try to tease apart kerygma and didache. /20

One last aspect of the question of conscience or the development and refinement of Christian awareness which is receiving increased attention again from scholars today is the social milieu and the authority structures within which it was all taking place. This is not the place even to attempt to paraphrase what scholars like Malherbe, Theissen or Holmberg are telling us, but certain points might be deemed useful:

1. In the NT we can discern various emergent structures in the churches for which, say, Matthew's Gospel, Paul's letters and Luke-Acts were written. In some cases the structures of authority can be discerned much more clearly than in other, due to the nature of the particular genre or the subject-matter being treated

2. Various functionaries in the churches use various modes of communication, e.g. prophecy, sentences of Holy Law, cataphesis, etc. though of course individuals may well in varying circumstances use more than one mode. All these would have some function in the refining of Christian awareness in the living community.

3. The NT writers do not "pull rank". Neither Paul nor John relies on any kind of succession as church officers for obvious reasons. The writer of 1 John speaks as a "presbyter" (undefined), but primarily he writes as one who shares with those whom he addresses in anointing by the Holy Spirit. /21

So also Paul who, for all his reference to his pneumatic gifts and energetic defence of his apostolate, actually identifies (1 Cor 15.8f) his apostolate with that of those who were called to it before him. In no way, however, does he hide behind an "office" in grappling with the problems of his churches. Significantly enough, he has recourse to such intimate and emotionally charged figures as fatherhood and motherhood (Gal 4.19 etc) and recommends that they be "imitators" (μιμηταί) of him as he too is of Christ, (1 Cor 11.1) in their growth into maturity (1 Cor 3.1f), a growth which he sometimes fails to see in them.

4. In Paul's modest though sometimes exasperated exercise of the authority he undoubtedly deemed himself to have (in spite of the fact that there were few if any sanctions available to him), it is worthy of note (a) that he responds in the Corinthian correspondence to a number of enquiries or reports from a position of clarity. He knows what they should do, but he does not explicitly force the issue. He leaves it to them.

(b) that in the course of the two letters about the Collection which probably form 2 Cor 8 and 9, he disclaims the idea that what he is putting forward is in the nature of a "command", ἐπιταγή (8.8). He nevertheless brings enormous psychological pressure to bear by means of

(i) an appeal to kenotic christology (8.9) which is picked up again in the second letter (9.13). This appeal to the kerygmatic core of the gospel is the specifically Christian element in his appeal to the Corinthians to get on with the Collection. It alone should form their awareness of what to do, but he backs it up with

(ii) reference to the generosity of the Macedonians which should put the people of Corinth on their mettle

(8.1-7 and 9.1-4);

(iii) use of Exodus 16.18 (at 8.15) and of Psalm 112.9 (at 9.9), as if they were Wisdom sayings;

(iv) Use of sayings from popular folk wisdom, (9.6); a

(v) the assertion that it must be a freewill offering which only serves to increase the psychological pressure them to make it (9.5c,7)!

1 Corinthians offers examples of the apostle's counsel varying levels of authority. Clearly the charge to the married woman not to separate from her husband (7.10-11) for which he uses the word παραγγέλλειν and which is referred to later (7.25) by the strong word ἐπιταγή, has normative force greater than the word addressed to mixed marriage partners (7.12-16) which begins: "To the rest, say, - not the Lord...etc". Interesting enough, this "I say...etc." is given support in the immediately following paragraph (7.17-24) by reference to the regulations which the apostle applies in "all the church". The verb here is διατάσσομαι which he uses again (1 Cor 11.34) with reference to directions on what are clearly secondary matters. (The primary matter in 11.17-32 concerning the misuse of the sacramental meal is settled by recourse to the primal authority of παράδοσις, "tradition" (vv23-24). /22 Clearly a generally accepted mode of conducting affairs is already emerging in the pauline churches - cf 11.16 - which it is enough to allude to.

In 1 Cor 7,8,10 as in Rom 14.2, 2 Cor 8-9 and Philemon (where it has been suggested that Paul uses less normative force than was available to him), there is no doubt that whether he has a "command" or "word" of the Lord or not, he at least is clear in his own mind as to what his correspondents should do, even though he leaves them (faute de mieux) to make up their own minds.

It happens to be the case that the NT documents give more information as to the relationship between the apostle Paul and his churches than about others. But in other letters, in Luke-Acts, and in the Gospel of Matthew, it is clear that we glimpse yet other authority structures, other modes of communication, prophecy, homily, παράκλησις

encouragement), παραίνεσις (exhortation), παράδοσις (tradition), which in varying combinations must have helped to form the conscience of the earliest Christian groupings. But the study of that is another day's work.

otes

This paper was originally delivered in a somewhat different form under the title "Conscience in the NT" at the annual Glenstal Ecumenical Conference in June 1982. Sections on the Pastorals and Hebrews have been omitted from this version).

- . An exception would be Wisdom 17.10
- . See Pierce, Conscience in the NT, London 1955, 21-65.
- . See Gerd Theissen, "Die Starken und Schwachen in Korinth. Soziologische Analyse eines theologischen Streites" (EvTh 35, 1975, 155-172)
- . See D. Cox, Jung and St. Paul, 1959
- . In the 19th century by Wrede, and most recently by K. Stendhal.
- . Pierce 22.
- . op.cit., 40-53
- . By E. Sanders, O. Michel and others.
- . 1 Cor 13.9-13
It is furthermore to be noted that the comments (1 Cor 8.7 and 1 Cor 13.12) on the meat controversy serve to highlight the relative insignificance of "knowledge" as against "love". See below
0. On νοῦς, see Bultmann, NT Theology, Vol 1, 211-20.
1. ibid 211.
2. The "weak" point of view is more likely to have been transmitted by oral transmission. See G. Theissen, loc.cit.
3. I am accepting the historical reliability of Acts account of this and of Acts 21.12-26.
4. See Theissen, loc.cit. 15. op.cit.109

16. I take it that the epistle to the Galatians is occasioned by Paul's hearing about the remedy for disillusionment offered by the subsequent teachers. Gal 6.1 refers to falling into "trespass" (παράπτωμα) and I take it that the inevitable regression into trespass was what left the Galatians so open to the legalism of the subsequent teachers. See H.R. Weber, Kreuz, Stuttgart 1975.
17. In the title of his book, The Community of the Beloved Disciple.
18. op.cit. 170
19. John 14.16
20. As a good deal of recent NT work has been making clear - notably J.I.H. McDonald, Kerygma and Didache, Cambridge 1980.
21. R.E. Brown, op.cit. 141-2
22. See McDonald, op.cit. 107ff.

The Rev Terence McCaughey is Senior Lecturer in Irish in Trinity College, Dublin, and a Minister of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. He is a graduate in Arts of Cambridge University and in Divinity at New College, Edinburgh where he specialized in NT.

The twenty-third Psalm is one of Christendom's most treasured texts. It is thus surprising perhaps to learn that the psalm has left scarcely a trace in early Christian literature. It is, in fact, never quoted in the NT and is cited but once in the Apostolic Fathers (see below). Nonetheless, one suspects that the Christian piety of early times could not have been unattracted to that psalm which later generations have found so encouraging; and this suspicion is confirmed by a critical combing of the sources. Indeed a close look at the few probable early allusions to Psalm 22 (LXX: 23 Masoretic Text) uncovers what seems to have been a customary way of reading the psalm about the Lord as shepherd.

Revelation 7.17 reads as follows: "For the Lamb in the midst of the throne will shepherd them (ποιμανεῖ; some mss have the present tense ποιμαίνει) and will lead them (ὀδογήσει; again, some mss have the present tense ὀδηγήσει) to springs of living water (ἐπὶ ζωῆς πηγᾶς ὕδατων), and he will wipe away every tear from their eyes." This verse probably depends in part upon Isaiah 49.10 (LXX). Certainly this is true of the preceding verse, Rev 7. 16. In John's apocalyptic vision, "And they will neither hunger nor thirst any more, neither will the sun strike them nor any scorching heat," he is clearly taking up Isaiah's words, "they will neither hunger nor thirst, neither will heat nor the sun smite them; but one having mercy will comfort them, and by springs of water he will lead (διὰ πηγῶν ὕδατων ἄξει)." The following sentence, Rev 7.17, which, like Isaiah 49.10, mentions springs of water, has probably been partially coloured by the OT text. But the scriptural background of Rev 7.17 is not thereby sufficiently complicated. For the notion that the Lamb in the midst of the throne will be a shepherd is not from Isaiah 49.10; and John's ὀδογήσει contrasts with Isaiah's ἄξει, nor does ἐπὶ match the LXX's διὰ. Moreover, and beyond these differences, there is, as Charles, Lohmeyer and others have observed, another scriptural text that supplies an even closer parallel for Revelation 7.17. /1 John the seer speaks of the one who shepherds his people and leads them to springs of water. It is difficult not to see here the influence of Ps 22(23) - especially when one sets out

the parallels in vocabulary: ποιμανεῖ/ποιμαίνει (Rev 7.17/Ps 22.1); ὁδογήσει/ὁδόγησεν (Rev 7.17/Ps 22.3); ἐπὶ... ὕδατων/ἐπὶ ὕδατος (Rev 7.17/Ps 22.2). Further, the theme of Ps 22(23) is largely "I shall not want," and this is also an apt summary of the thrust of Rev 7.16-17. So the Psalmist's picture of the Lord shepherding his people beside still waters seems to lie beneath the text of Revelation.

Two observations are to be made concerning the use of Ps 22 in Rev 7.17. First, the shepherd is not the Lord God of the OT. He is rather the Lamb in the midst of the throne, Jesus Christ. Secondly, the psalm is used as if it were prophetic. That is, its promises are used to depict the conditions of the coming redemption. This second observation is particularly interesting, and it leads one to ask, Is there any other evidence that Ps 22 (23) was given an eschatological interpretation by early Christians?

Chapters 24-27 of 1 Clement concern themselves with the doctrine of the general resurrection of the dead. Chapters 24 and 25 offer evidence for the reasonableness of that doctrine. Chapter 26 summons scriptural support. And chapter 27 contains exhortations to believe in the God who is all-powerful and faithful to his declared purpose.

The twenty-sixth chapter is of particular interest for our purposes. Clement writes, "For he (God) says in a certain place, 'And thou wilt raise me up, and I shall praise thee' (Ps 27.7?), and 'I went to rest and slept, I was awakened (ps 3.6) for thou art with me' (ὅτι σὺ μετ' ἐμοῦ εἶ = Ps 22.4). /2 And again, Job says, 'And thou wilt raise this my flesh which has endured all these things' " (Job 19.26). Several OT passages are here gathered in what must seem to us a rather confusing and unconvincing fashion. Particularly odd is the clear citation of Ps 22.4, "For thou art with me." How did our author come to connect this line with the doctrine of the resurrection? Knowing the content of Ps 22, one is initially inclined to conclude that Clement was simply guilty of drawing upon the text in a completely

trary manner. But when we recall the use made of 22 in Rev 7.17, caution is required. For the passage Revelation takes the picture of the twenty-second Psalm apply to the future - Jesus will shepherd his people he will lead them to springs of living water. Thus may be suggested that Clement's use of Psalm 22 should be considered either idiosyncratic or utterly arbitrary. We may rather have to do with exegetical tradition. Clement uses Ps. 22 as did the author of the Apocalypse, both use the psalm as if it were a prophecy of the eschatological future.

There is one final passage at which we must look, namely, Mark 6.32-34, the story of the feeding of the five thousand. Commentators have long debated the import of this striking, anomalous reference to "green grass" in 6.39. Is this notice the sure trace of an eye-witness? Or is it perhaps an indication of the Palestinian spring, the time of the Passover (cf John 6.4,10)? Or is it a messianic sign, evidence that the wilderness has begun to bring forth miraculous bloom? These questions rapidly solve when one discovers that allusions to Ps 22(23) are apparently imbedded in Mark 6.32-44:

Psalm 22(23)
The Lord is my shepherd (1)

My sheep shall not want (1)

He makes me to lie down
in green pastures (2)
ἐν τόποις χλόης)

Mark 6

They were like sheep
without a shepherd (34)
They all ate and were
satisfied

He commanded them all
to sit down by
companies upon the green
grass (ἐπὶ τῇ χλωρῇ χορτῷ)
(39)

In the Markan setting may recollect Ps 22(23):2, "He leads me beside still waters"; the feeding takes place at the shore in the evening (Mark 6.34,35). In any event, Mark 6.32-44, as it now stands, contains elements which conjure the images of Ps 22(23), and the picture in both is the same: the shepherd cares for his flock on the green grass beside the water, and the sheep have no lack. /3

If Mark 6.32-34 does indeed draw upon Ps 22(23), then two remarks are to be made. First, as in Rev 7.17, the shepherd is Jesus. Then, secondly, as in Rev 7.17, and 1 Clement 26, the allusion to Psalm 22(23) comes in an eschatological context. Even if the feeding of the five thousand should not be interpreted as an anticipation of the great messianic banquet, /4 the passage Mark 6.32ff, in the words of Eduard Schweizer, certainly presents Jesus "as the one who excels all the prophets and is, therefore, the one who brings salvation in the end-time." /5 Jesus is in fact here the prophet who gathers and sustains the restored people of Israel; and just as the first redeemer, Moses, fed the Israelites manna in the wilderness, so the second redeemer, inaugurating the new Exodus, miraculously feeds the multitude bread. /6 Thus the allusions to Ps 22(23) in Mark 6 belong to a story whose meaning is to be discerned eschatologically.

Having now examined three early texts that refer or allude to Ps 22(23), it may be said that they share a common interpretation: Jesus is the shepherd and the psalm's promises have to be interpreted eschatologically. If so, one question remains to be answered. How do we account for this tradition? Why did early Christians identify the shepherd of Ps 22(23) with Jesus and why did they refer the lines of that Psalm to eschatology?

The NT contains a number of texts (none by the way Pauline) in which Jesus is given the title, "shepherd", e.g. "Jesus said to them, 'You will all fall away; for it is written, I will strike the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered. But after I am raised up, I will go before you into Galilee'" (Mark 14.27,28); or the allegory of the Good Shepherd (John 10.1-18); "the Lord Jesus, the great shepherd of the sheep" (Heb 13.20) (cf also 1 Pet 2.25; 5.4 and Rev 7.17). There are also additional texts which through their imagery make it plain that Jesus was widely portrayed as being the shepherd of the Christian sheep, e.g. "go rather to the sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt 10.6;15.24); or "The Son of Man came to seek and to save the lost" (Luke 19.10). Hence it is only natural that thoughts turned to Jesus

from the early church read of the good shepherd of Ps 22(23). Beyond this, Jewish eschatology knew of a shepherd who would come and reign in the end of days. Ezekial 34.23-24 reads, "And I will set up over them one shepherd, my servant, David, and he shall feed them; he will feed them and be their shepherd. And I, the Lord, will be their God, and my servant David will be prince among them; I, the Lord, have spoken." We may note also, "He shall stand and feed his flock in the strength of the Lord" (Micah 5.3(4)) and especially "(He will be) shepherding the flock of the Lord faithfully and righteously, and will suffer none of them to stumble in their pasture." (Psalms of Solomon 17.45(40); cf also the difficult verses in Zechariah:10.3;11.4-17 and 13.7). The description of the promised messiah in the Psalms of Solomon is striking. Now the NT does not lose sight of the eschatological connotation which the title "shepherd" had in Judaism. Mark 14.27-28 tells us that Jesus was the one who fulfilled Zechariah's prophecies about the shepherd who would suffer in the tribulation of the latter days. 1 Peter 5.4 offers the comfort that "when the chief shepherd is manifested you will obtain the fading crown of glory." And Rev 7.17 foresees the day when the Lamb in the midst of the throne will shepherd and lead his people to springs of living water. /8

All of this means that the thought of Jesus as shepherd was frequently linked with thoughts about the end-time. Not only had Jesus at his first coming fulfilled the future prophecies of Zechariah chapters nine to fourteen, but at his second coming he would, it is held, fulfil all the prophecies of a messianic shepherd (cf Ezekial 34.23-24). No doubt it was this belief in Jesus as the Davidic shepherd which encouraged the interpretation of Ps 22(23) reflected in Revelation 17, 1 Clement 26 and Mark 6.32-44. As they waited for the parousia, for the shepherd who would rule over Israel and the nations, the first followers of Jesus would think of the assurances of Ps 22(23) as pertaining to the future.

Notes

1. R.H. Charles, The Revelation of St. John (ICC: Edinburgh, T & T Clark 1920), I, 216-217; Ernst Lohmeyer, Die Offenbarung des Johannes (HNT 16; 2nd Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1950) 73
2. The "for thou art with me" from Ps 22.4 replaces the "for the Lord will help me" of Ps 3.6; see further D.A. Hagner, The Use of the Old and New Testament in Clement of Rome (NovTSup 34; Leiden: E.J. Brill 1973) 58-59.
3. Cf. R. Pesch, Das Markusevangelium (HTKNT 11/1; 2nd Freiburg: Herder 1977), 1.350, 352, 355-56.
4. See Albert Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus (trans. by W. Montgomery; NYork: MacMillan 196 376-77. It is worth noting in this connection that the feeding of the five thousand recalls the Lord's Supper ("taking....he blessed, and broke....and gave" and that the latter was understood as a foretaste of the messianic feast (cf 1 Cor 11.26 and Didache 9-10
5. Eduard Schweizer, The Good News According to Mark (trans. by Donald H. Madvig; Atlanta: John Knox 1976) 140.
6. Cf. Madelèine Boucher, The Mysterious Parable: A Literary Study (CBQMS 6: Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America 1977) 73-75 and note John 6.14 and 31-34.
7. For discussion see J. Jeremias, ποιμὴν ktl.. TDNT 6 (1968) 492-493.
8. It is also possible that the sayings in Rev 2.27; 12 and 19.15 which use ποιμαίνω should be mentioned here. It is, however, difficult to determine whether a conscious use of shepherd imagery was here intended; See Jeremias, *ibid.*, 494 N.87.

Dr Dale C. Allison, Jr., holds the Doctor of Philosophy of Duke University and is currently on the Faculty of Texas Christian University in Fort worth, Texas.

nnis Brown, Saint Jerome as a Biblical Exegete

Questions from, or allusions to, the works of the Church Fathers are sometimes found in introductions to commentaries on biblical books. But, in the same way that recent critical research has stressed that biblical quotations cannot be properly understood without reference to the theological, social and cultural context from which they come, it is beginning to be realised that quotations from the Church Fathers cannot be lifted arbitrarily from the pages of Migné or the Corpus Christianorum, but must be placed in their proper context. It is the purpose of this paper to set out, in a systematic form, the background and principles of exegesis used by St. Jerome, the greatest biblical scholar of the 4th century. /1

Two facets of the personality of Jerome are of vital importance to a proper understanding of his exegesis - his love of knowledge and his search for the holy life. Jerome's education was the best that could be had. Instead of sending him for his secondary education to a grammar school in or near Stridon, his wealthy parents sent him to Rome, the capital of the Empire, to be trained by one of the most famous teachers of his day, Helius Donatus. /3 Under his tutelage Jerome became immersed in classical studies, and developed a real flair for rhetoric. In his later works, Jerome quotes from the classical authors on almost every page, and rhetorical flourishes are often seen, especially in his polemical works.

Jerome's search for the holy life started at about the time his schooldays finished (c365 AD, aged about 10). Shortly after he left Rome, he joined an ascetic community in the desert of Chalcis, near Antioch, where he supported himself "by the daily labour of my hands and of my own sweat." /4 Jerome left this community after about two years, but he never lost his desire to become as close to God as possible through the ascetic life. When Jerome returned to Rome in

382AD, he was able to work out a programme of asceticism
/5 which was to be put into practice later at Bethlehem
/6 Jerome's theology of asceticism was both christo-
logical and eschatological. It was christological in
that Christ, the true Son of God, is the model for the
ascetic life. It was eschatological in that the perfect
life is the life of heaven, and therefore the ascetic life
is one which will be perfected only after the parousia
of the lord of history. These two thrusts are manifested
in a life of renunciation and virginity. /7

These two facets of Jerome's personality, his love of
knowledge and his search for the holy life, found their
fulfilment in the study of the bible. The bible was
God's book and was therefore holy, and could give direction
as to how to live a holy, ascetic life. It also contained
many mysteries and "hard sayings", so that it required
constant and untiring study in order to understand it
properly. It is Jerome's methods of studying the
bible to which we must now turn.

Before one could interpret the text of the bible aright
one had to know exactly what that text said. This meant
that one had to have a good knowledge of the languages of
the bible, Greek and Hebrew, and also a knowledge of the
science of textual criticism. As far as the NT was
concerned, Jerome encountered no problems, for he had
learnt Greek at school, and had attended the Greek lectures
of Gregory of Nazianzus in Constantinople. /8 But for
the text of the OT, Jerome was faced with considerable
difficulties for, apart from Origen in the 3rd century,
no other Christian scholar had known any Hebrew.

The reason for this is not difficult to find. When
Christianity arose out of Judaism, it inherited the
biblical text which the Jews had used, the Septuagint.
This Greek version had become hallowed by three centuries
of Christian usage, and no need was felt to go beyond
this text to the Hebrew original. Indeed from the second
century onwards Christians began to base their use of the
LXX on the argument from apostolicity. Jesus and the
disciples, it was argued, when they quoted scripture, had
used the LXX and not the Hebrew text. This argument lent

the LXX a high degree of authority, and from this stemmed a belief in the inspiration of the LXX equal (if not superior) to that of the Hebrew original. So Origen believed that the LXX was divinely inspired. /9 Although Origen, as a scholar, knew that the Hebrew text was the original one, he never moved away from the accepted position of the Church that the LXX was the Christian OT. Origen did study the Hebrew text, but his primary purpose in doing so was as a polemical tool since, with the knowledge this study gave him, he would be better equipped to combat the arguments of the Jews. /10

For Jerome, however, there was another reason for studying Hebrew. He took his first Hebrew lessons from a Jewish convert to Christianity while he was in the desert of Chalcia, and says:

When I was a young man, walled in by the loneliness of the desert, I was unable to resist the temptations of vice and the hot passions of my nature. Although I tried to crush them with repeated fasting my mind was in a turmoil with sinful thoughts. To bring it under control, Iset myself to learn an alphabet and strove to pronounce hissing, breath-taking words. /11

This rhetorical piece, however, is written with the benefit of hindsight, (it was composed in 411) and it is likely that Jerome's natural intellectual curiosity and his perception of the place of Hebrew in exegesis played just as large a part in his decision to learn Hebrew as did his ascetic motives.

It is clear from Jerome's account that he found Hebrew a difficult language to learn. This is evident when we remember that the structure of Hebrew was very different from that of Latin or Greek, and that no grammars, concordances or dictionaries existed to assist Jerome in his studies. He says of his Hebrew studies:

What labour I spent on this task, what difficulties I went through, how often

I despaired and how often I gave up and
in my eagerness to learn, started again.

/12

The question of just how extensive was Jerome's knowledge of Hebrew is very difficult to answer. The modern scholarly consensus seems to point to the conclusion that, when Jerome is compared with other Hebrew scholars who came before him like Origen and Philo, Jerome is seen to have a very much more profound grasp of the Hebrew language. If Jerome's knowledge of Hebrew is compared with our modern knowledge of Hebrew, then many faults show up in Jerome's work, but this method of working, used by some early 20th century scholars, is anachronistic and any judgments based on it are worthless. Jerome must always be studied in his own context and must not be viewed through twentieth century eyes.

One way in which Jerome's good working knowledge of Hebrew is shown is in the fact that he undertook to translate the OT from the Hebrew. Even bearing in mind the previous Greek translations of Theodotion, Symmachus and especially Aquila, which would have helped him considerably, Jerome's own translation was a remarkable achievement, especially when it is noted that it is generally a good and faithful rendering.

Another indication that Jerome's knowledge of Hebrew was far superior to that of any of his predecessors is that he was able to recognize various features of Hebrew style, especially assonance. One example of this is at the call of Jeremiah, where Jerome explains the play on words between זֶרַע (shaged; Latin nux, "nut-tree") and זֶרַע (shoged; Latin vigilia, "watch"), obvious in Hebrew, but not apparent in translation. The attention to detail is characteristic of Jerome's approach to Hebrew and to the matter of translation on the whole.

Once Jerome had acquired the ability to read the bible in its original languages, his next task was to decide which was the most accurate text. With numerous variant readings in many manuscripts, this was a very

difficult task. /13 But here Jerome could count on the work of his predecessor, Origen, who has in his Hexapla taken over from classical times a number of critical sigla, indicate where the LXX text differed from that of the Hebrew, and had made some observations on text criticism. Jerome voiced the desire of every text critic when he said that he wished to remove the transmissional errors in the biblical text and establish a trustworthy text. /14

Jerome's commentaries are a treasure-store of comments on various principles of textual criticism. /15 He refers frequently, for instance, to the effect of punctuation on the understanding of a passage. /16 In these cases, he often comments on the given interpretation if it is familiar to his readers, and then goes on to show what he thinks is the correct punctuation, commenting on it. Jerome often mentions that similar letters can easily be confused. In Hebrew, for example, the letters resh (cf English letter "r") and daleth (cf English letter "d") are, Jerome says, only distinguished by a small apex, /17 and the letters waw (cf English "v") and yod (cf English "y") only differ in size. /18 Examples like these suggest that Jerome was well aware of the causes and kinds of error which could appear in a biblical manuscript and, by and large, the criteria he uses to make a judgment between two variants are those which are employed by modern textual critics, viz, the antiquity of the manuscripts, /19 intrinsic probability /20, and transcriptional probability /21. Jerome's excellence as a textual critic was unmatched in the early Church, even by Origen.

Only after Jerome had thus established the biblical text by translating it from the original languages and by exercising the principles of textual criticism, could he move on to the more important task of interpreting the biblical words for his readers. The major part of Jerome's literary output is in commentary form, and he spent most of his life composing major commentaries on most of the books of the OT (and especially the prophets) and on some of the NT books. It is to the exegetical methods used in these commentaries that we now turn.

The aim of a commentary, for Jerome, was "to discuss what is obscure, to touch on the obvious, to dwell at length on what is doubtful." /22 Scripture, to Jerome, was full of obscurities /23 and a reliable guide is needed. A commentary ought always to

Repeat the opinions of the many...so that the judicious reader, when he has perused the different explanations.....may judge which is the best, and, like a good banker, reject the money from a spurious mint.

/24

In most of his commentaries, Jerome acknowledges the previous authors from whom he has borrowed, and it could almost be said that Jerome's commentaries are nothing but a compendium of portions culled from the works of others.

In the fourth century Church, there were two predominant exegetical schools, those at Antioch and Alexandria. The Antiochene school was founded as a reaction against the allegorising interpretation of Alexandria, and emphasized the literal meaning of the biblical text. It can be shown that Jerome borrowed some of the principles of both schools in the formulation of his own exegetical method.

One of the foremost exponents of the Antiochene school was Theodore of Mopsuestia, whose nickname "the interpreter" suggests the motivating force of his life interpretation of the bible. He set down what he saw as the exegete's task: "I judge the exegete's task to be to explain words that most people find difficult.. he must give the meaning and do it concisely." Sometimes though precision may not be possible, especially when he must deal with passages "which have been corrupted by the wiles of heretics." /25 This is very similar to Jerome's statement which was quoted above, and, like Jerome, Theodore's method is to comment on a book verse by verse, only pausing on difficult passages, or where a theological point is at issue. His most interesting exegetical work is the Commentary on Psalms, in which

considerable attention is paid to textual criticism, and, though Theodore did not know Hebrew himself, he was convinced that a knowledge of "the language the prophet actually spoke" was essential. Generally, he relied on the Vulgate, but, realizing that no one translation was adequate to convey the meaning of the original, he also used other Greek versions, notably that of Symmachus.

Jerome gave a real value to the literal sense of Scripture. Even in his very first piece of exegesis on the call of Isaiah Jerome begins with a strictly historical exposition of "who this Uzziah was, how many years he had reigned and who among the other kings were his contemporaries" /27 as well as the dating of the passage. Only after this does Jerome move on to the spiritual interpretation of the passage.

Again in the Commentary on Ephesians, composed in 388, Jerome interprets

Therefore it is said,
"Awake, O sleeper, and arise from
the dead,
and Christ shall give you light"

(5.14)

explaining that the words were spoken to Adam who was crucified at Calvary where Christ was crucified. The place is called Calvary because the head of some ancient man had been buried there and because, when Christ was crucified, he was hanging directly above the place where he was buried. /28 G. Grützmacher, Jerome's biographer, argued plausibly that in this commentary Jerome was mainly dependent on the work of Apollinarius of Laodicea. /29

In the Commentary on Malachi, written in 406, Jerome criticizes Origen's almost complete neglect of the literal sense;

He does not pay any attention to the historia
but spends all his time on the allegorical
interpretation.

/30

Jerome's last unfinished commentary on Jeremiah, his

criticisms of Origen's interpretations are more severe than ever before (he refers to Origen as "the mad allegorist" /31), while his own interpretation is mainly historical.

However, while Jerome followed the Antiochene school of exegesis in believing that the plain words of the text had great value, he realized that Christians must go beyond the literal meaning for behind them lay the fuller, deeper meaning of the passage. One could understand this deeper or hidden meaning with the aid of the spiritual or allegorical method.

The allegorical method had had a long history of development in Alexandria, culminating in the interpretative method of Philo. This was adapted for Christianity and further refined by Clement, who was the first Christian scholar to formulate the doctrine that the text of scripture contains a hidden meaning everywhere. Mysteries have been hidden in the bible for the benefit of intellectual Christians and to disguise some doctrines which would prove disturbing for simple Christians. /32 Clement's pupil and successor, Origen, is the most famous exponent of the allegorical method, and his influence on the exegesis of the following centuries was enormous.

When we study Jerome's use of the allegorical method we see an interesting phenomenon. Many of Jerome's specific allegorical interpretations are taken directly from Origen, even to the extent of verbal borrowing, But the meaning attached to the technical terminology Jerome uses to describe the spiritual or allegorical sense is not usually that of the Alexandrian school. The terms typus and aenigma show this clearly.

Typus only occurs rarely in the writings of Clement and Origen, and, when it does, it usually has no specific exegetical significance. /33 Among the Antiochene Fathers however it has more importance. Theodore of Mopsuestia with whose works Jerome may have been familiar developed a "theology of typology" in his Commentary on Jonah. A type has three characteristics:

st, it bears a resemblance to the object of which it is image; second, the persons involved derive profit from and this is an indication of the benefits in the future promises; third, it contains the firm belief that future reality will be of greater importance than the present image. /34 Theodore finds examples of this in incidents like the smearing of blood on the doorposts at the Exodus from Egypt, which was a type of Christian liberation from sin and death by Christ's crucifixion and resurrection. Jerome discusses types at various places in his commentaries, but especially at Galatians 4. 22-24. He mentions Paul's use of the figures of Mounts Sinai and Sion as types of Sarah and Hagar. Jerome then says that Isaac is a type of Christ, and Leah and Rachel are types of the Church and Synagogue respectively. He continues:

For what the type shows is only a part.
If indeed the whole meaning is given
in the earlier type, it is no longer
then a type but should be described
as the truth of history. (The Latin
runs: Typus enim partem indicat, quod
si totum praecedat in typo iam non est
typus, sed historiae veritas appellanda
est)

/35

is is very similar to Theodore's stress on the need for a type to have a clear object or anti-type.

The term aenigma was compared by Origen with parabola. That they both have in common is that both describe things as having happened which did not happen. They differ in that what is described in a parable is capable of historical realisation whereas what is described in an enigma is not, for an enigma is a deep saying, signifying something hidden and inexpressible. /36 A different view is seen in the Antiochene exegete, Theodore of Tarsus, who distinguishes between an enigma and an allegory. For Diodore, enigmas are realities which belong to the order of visible things and which contain hidden meanings. /37

In Jerome's writings, aenigma is frequently

associated with parabola. Both are obscure and both use figurative language. /38 Elsewhere, however, Jerome, while implying that parables give an obscure clue to the truth, classifies them with similies as the rhetoricians do. /39 So it is implied, if never explicitly stated, that parables and enigmas are not synonymous terms. So far this sounds rather like the meaning of enigma in Origen. But another passage shows us how Jerome really thought of aenigma. In a long section dealing with the legitimacy of the works of Pythagoras, Plato, Empedocles and other classical authors and their use by Christians, Jerome quotes from the enigmas to which Aristotle referred:

There are enigmas which Aristotle has
very diligently collated in his works

/40

From this, and the examples of the enigma he quotes from Aristotle, we may infer that Jerome, trained as a classicist, understood and used the term aenigma in his works from the standpoint of a grammarian. He is not concerned with the philosophic question of whether an enigma has any inherent reality. Here Jerome shows a certain independence from the two exegetical schools and, for once, does not follow either the Alexandrians or the Antiochenes.

As we mentioned earlier, many of Jerome's specific allegorical interpretations are taken over from Origen's commentaries. This is the case before the Origenist controversy in which Jerome played a leading part (393-402) and, after it, when Jerome had renounced Origen's theology as heretical. The influence of Origen whom Jerome had at one time proudly called "my master" can be seen on almost every page of Jerome's works. We have time here for only two examples.

The Commentary on Galatians, written in 388, provides a good example of Jerome's exegetical dependence on Origen. Jerome could not believe that Peter and Paul, the two key apostles, could have quarrelled and that Peter could have reverted to Judaism (Gal 2: 11-21). So he explains the passage by arguing that Paul only

reached Peter for the sake of the Judaizers and Gentiles that the disagreement was only a piece of play-acting; and Paul remained friends. /41 Later, in a letter to Augustine, he recalls that this interpretation was taken from the tenth book of the Stromateis of Origen, also noting that John Chrysostom had adopted the same interpretation. /42

The second example is very interesting for we can compare directly with Origen's Commentary on Matthew, large portions of which are still extant. Jerome wrote his commentary on Matthew in the space of fourteen days, in order to provide his friend Eusebius of Cremona with reading material for a sea voyage. /43 In his interpretation of the parable of the hidden treasure (Matthew 13: 44ff) Jerome clearly followed Origen. The main points of their respective interpretations are set out below:

Jerome

The treasure is the word of God which appears to be hidden in the body of Christ, or in the holy scriptures in which rests the knowledge of the Kingdom of God. When the treasure is discovered, we must give up all the involumenta in order to possess it

Origen

This is not a parable but a similitude. The field equals the scripture.

The treasure equals the mysteries lying within the scripture, and finding the treasure a man hides it, thinking it dangerous to reveal to all and sundry the secrets of scripture.

He goes, sells all his possessions, and works until he can buy the field, in order that he may possess the great treasure.

Jerome's interpretation appears clearly to have links with Origen in addition to the similarities that are inevitable with the same parable being interpreted. Yet Jerome's interpretation is simpler and more direct in its application of the meaning of the parable.

Jerome is not interested in Origen's distinction between a parable and a similitude, the latter being a generic term, the former a particular form of similitude. We should note that Jerome sets down two different interpretations of the treasure - it is either the word of God hidden in the body of Christ, or it is the knowledge of the Saviour hidden in scripture. His first interpretation does not come from Origen. It is evident that such a parable suits Jerome's characteristic ascetic interest.

It is not only specific passages of spiritual interpretation which Jerome borrows from Origen's commentary on Matthew, but also certain themes of the commentary. One of these, very important for Origen, was the goodness of God which he used to combat the Gnosticism of his day. This theme is seen in Jerome's Commentary on Matthew several times. /44

Toward the end of his life, after the trauma of the Origenist controversy, it is interesting to note that Jerome was more critical of some of Origen's contentious exegetical interpretations. This trend is seen most clearly of all in the Commentary on Jeremiah where Origen is denounced as "that allegorist", his unorthodox views are fiercely attacked, and Jerome relies less than in any other commentary on Origen's allegorical interpretations.

We have now seen that Jerome was familiar with both the major schools of Christian exegesis at Alexandria and Antioch, and indeed he borrowed from both of them. We have also seen that he was the only fourth century Church Father to have learnt Hebrew. To do this he took lessons from learned Jews. It is interesting to inquire whether he borrowed any Jewish exegesis from these Jews to incorporate into his own commentaries. In fact, Jerome knew a good deal about Jews and Judaism, and it can be shown that he incorporates many hundreds of Jewish traditions into his own exegesis. It remains in this paper to give one or two examples of this.

Jerome was a man of his time in that he displays

anti-Jewish tendencies. Several times, for instance, he refers to Jewish learning as "belching and nausea." /45 When these comments of Jerome are set alongside the anti-Jewish statements of other contemporary writers, and indeed the polemical outbursts directed against other Christians by Jerome, then his comments against the Jews are more understandable if not excusable.

Jerome believed, however, that Jewish traditions of exegesis were of great importance for Christians in their interpretation of the OT, as long as they were consistent with the teaching of scripture;

I once proposed to make available to Latin readers the secrets of Hebrew learning and the recondite teachings of the masters of the synagogue, so long as the latter is in keeping with the holy scriptures."

/46

of the best-known rabbinic traditions used by Jerome that Daniel and the three young men with him were eunuchs. Jerome's comment on Daniel 1.3 is as follows:

From this passage the Hebrews think that Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah were eunuchs, thus fulfilling that prophecy which is spoken by the prophet Isaiah to Hezekiah (Isaiah 39: 7).

Isaiah 39: 7 reads, "And some of your own sons, who are born to you, shall be taken away; and they shall be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon." Because of the explicit statement in Daniel 1:4 that these men had no blemish, some of the rabbinic traditions attempted to argue that they had been eunuchs but were healed when they passed through the fiery furnace. /48 But the dominant opinion among the Rabbis was that Daniel and the young men were eunuchs.

Again, in his Commentary on Daniel (5.2) Jerome records the following Jewish tradition concerning Belshazzar:

The Hebrews hand down a story of this sort: Belshazzar, thinking that God's promise had

remained without effect until the 70th year, by which Jeremiah had said that the captivity of the Jewish people would have to be ended (cf Jeremiah 25:12; 29:10ff) - a matter of which Zechariah also speaks in the first part of his book (cf Zechariah 1: 12ff) - and turning the occasion of the failed promise into a celebration, gave a great banquet by way of mocking the expectation of the Jews and the vessels of the Temple of God.

Jeremiah had promised Israel that their exile would be temporary. After 70 years they would return to their land and glory while their oppressors, the Babylonians, would be destroyed e.g. "Then after seventy years are completed, I will punish the king of Babylon and that nation, the land of the Chaldeans, for their iniquity, says the Lord, making the land an everlasting waste." (Jeremiah 25:12; cf also 29:10ff; Zechariah 1: 12ff; Daniel 9:2). The chronological problem is to determine which year begins the seventy year period. In Megillah 11b it is explained that Belshazzar began his count with the first year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign (605 BC). This rabbinic source explicitly says that Belshazzar was mistaken in his calculations, a point which is implied by Jerome. The seventy year period should have begun from the second year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign and not the first (cf 2 Kings 24:1). Jerome is the only early Church Father to mention this tradition.

Scholars studying Jerome's use of rabbinic traditions have usually assumed that Jerome has taken traditions direct from Jewish sources. But there are a few instances where it is apparent that he must have copied out the Jewish material from the commentaries of Origen, who also made use of Jewish exegesis. These instances are quite rare in Jerome's works but are worth noticing. We have space to give only one example here.

In his Letters - Epistulae 18A,15, written in 381-2 - dealing with the subject of the two Seraphim in Isaiah 6:6-9, Jerome makes a comparison of Isaiah with Moses and Jeremiah. He says that he discussed this with some Jews,

reassures his reader that this tradition comes from an excellent (Jewish) source and should be accepted. Jerome gives the impression that he has gleaned this tradition from direct conversation and study with Jews. But, in fact, he borrowed it from Origen who had reported it in his sixth sermon on Isaiah, saying that both Isaiah and Moses had received God's command at first, on the basis of their worthiness, but had subsequently accepted.

We come now to the point where we must conclude this short study of the Biblical exegesis of St. Jerome. We have seen that Jerome was essentially an eclectic scholar, borrowing principles of textual criticism, and specific interpretations of scripture from other scholars, both Christian and Jewish. We should not criticize him too much for plagiarising thus, as he stated this as his purpose in writing commentaries - to explain what others had already said. Jerome wrote very quickly, and one of the reasons he borrowed so much from previous writers may have been because he did not have time to think out his own answers. We would have found Donne's aphorism, "No man is an island", particularly apt.

Jerome was not primarily a creative thinker although his works are not devoid of novelty. He was a man driven by his education and asceticism to delve into the riches of the bible and especially the prophets, for he believed that the bible contained everything that was necessary to know and love God. His joy was to "meditate on the law of the Lord day and night."

ees

The details of Jerome's life are easily accessible in Cambridge History of the Bible Vol I (CUP 1970), pp510-540, and J.N.D. Kelly, Jerome, (London 1975)

That Jerome's family was wealthy, see Epistulae 82.2; 66.14 where Jerome instructs his brother Paulinian to go back to Stridon and sell up the family estates; cf also 3.5 where Jerome recalls running through the slave quarters at home in his childhood.

3. Jerome mentions him with pride at several places, e.g. Commentary on Ecclesiastes 1.9f; Apologia contra Rufinus 1.16. The two grammars of Donatus are extant in H. Keil, Grammatici Latini (Leipzig 1865).
4. Epistulae 17.2
5. ibid.22
6. For the founding of the two monasteries at Bethlehem, see Epistulae 108 and Kelly, op.cit. pp118-140.
7. See E.P. Burke, "St. Jerome as a Spiritual Director" in A Monument to Saint Jerome ed. F.X. Murphy (NYork 1952) pp145-160; D.Dumm, The Theological Basis of Virginity According to St. Jerome (Latrobe, Pa.1961)
8. See his church history of biographies in De Viris illustribus ("On famous men"), 117; Epistulae 50.1; 52.8; Apologia contra Rufinum 1.13; Kelly, op.cit., p70, and D. Winslow, The Dynamics of Salvation: A Study in Gregory of Nazianzus (Cambridge, Mass. 1979)
9. He even believed that its mistakes were divinely inspired! See, for example, his homilies on Leviticus (Hom.in Lev.) 12.5
10. See Ep.ad. Afric.5; On Prayer 14.
11. Epistulae, 125.12
12. Ibid
13. See Jerome's comments at Pref.in Lib.Paralip; Pref.in Quat.Evang., where he says there are as many variants as there are manuscripts.
14. Epistulae 27.1
15. Studies of these are to be found in K.K.Hulley: "The Principles of Textual Criticism known to St Jerome" in Harvard Studies in Classical Philology LV (1933) pp87-111, and more recently in B.M. Metzger, "St Jerome's Explicit References to Variant Readings in Manuscripts of the NT."

in New Testament Studies: Philological, Versional and Patristic (Leiden 1980), pp199; p210

16. E.G. Commentary on Micah, 1; Epistulae 104.6
17. Commentary on Isaiah 12 and often elsewhere
18. Quest.Heb.in Gen.and passim
19. See Contra Pelagium 2.7; Epistulae 127.6
20. See Commentary on Matthew 11, 19; Commentary on Galatians 2.5
21. See Tract. in Ps.77; Comm.Matt.13,35
22. Commentary on Galatians 4.6
23. Epistulae 105.5
24. Apologia contra Rufinum 1.16
25. Commentary on John: Introduction
26. The original Greek of much of this commentary was recovered by R. Devreësse: Le Commentaire de Théodore de Mopsuëste sur les Psaumes (1-80) (Studi e Testi 93) Rome 1939
27. Ep.18A,1
28. Commentary on Ephesians 5.14
29. G. Grützmacher: Hieronymus (Leipzig 1901), Vol 2, p40; cf also A. Souter, The Earliest Latin Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul (Oxford 1927), p110
30. Commentary on Malachi, Pro1
31. Comm.Hier.24.1-10; 27.9-11; 28.12-14
32. Strom 6.15,129
33. See, for example, Clement, Strom. 4.25; Origen, Commentary on John 10.35
34. Commentary on Jonah, Pro1.
35. Commentary on Galatians 4.22f
36. Frag.in Prov.1.6

37. Cf L. Maries, Extraits du Commentaire de Diodore de Tarse sur les Psaumes in R.S.R.9 (1919), pp94ff
38. Comm. Ezek17.1ff; cf Comm.Isa 16.1; Comm.Amos 9.1
39. Epistulae 121.6
40. Apologia contra Rufinum 3.39
41. Commentary on Galatians 2.11ff
42. Epistulae 112.6
43. Commentary on Matthew: Prol
44. E.g. 5.1; 10.1; 10.40; 11.30; 13.1-2; 17.7
45. Preface to Lib.Heb.Nom.
46. Commentary on Zechariah 6.9-15
47. Commentary on Daniel 1.3
48. See Jerusalem Talmud, Shabbat 6.9

The Manse

First Comber Presbyterian Church

Co. Down

Dennis Brown

Mr Brown holds the degrees of B.D. (Edinburgh) and of S.T.M (Union Theological Seminary, NYork) and is at present doing research on Jerome in connection with a D. Phil degree at Oxford University.

D. Miller, Sin and Judgment in the Prophets: a stylistic and theological analysis

Scholars Press, Chico, 1982 pp x + 143 NP

This volume in the Society of Biblical Literature series of monographs (No.27) is a useful and interesting contribution to our understanding of the OT prophets. Dr Miller is properly cautious not to claim too much for his study, which is of limited scope, but the fact remains that the themes of sin and judgment are both ubiquitous and central in the prophetic corpus, and by his careful and persuasive analysis Miller has given us greater clarity and depth of understanding of the Prophets.

Miller places himself in an ongoing debate on the prophetic concept of judgment, making reference to a number of recent scholars; but it would be true to say that he is chiefly concerned with the arguments of Klaus Koch, whose 1955 article is still very influential. Koch maintained there that the OT contains no doctrine of retribution, and that Yahweh is not envisaged in the role of judge; instead, crime brings its own punishment, by a sort of interior logic. Punishment could therefore be described in terms of fate, except that Koch was careful to give Yahweh a (rather limited) role in the otherwise mechanical process. Part of Koch's reasoning is linguistic; he argued from the fact that a number of Hebrew words, notably ra, can denote both an evil deed and its consequence.

Miller accordingly examines in depth and detail a large number of passages in the prophetic literature (including The Former Prophets, i.e. the Deuteronomistic History), and reaches his own conclusions on their correct exegesis. Ultimately he comes down firmly against Koch's conclusions, and asserts that Yahweh is implicitly seen to be judge, and that judgments are viewed as retribution.

Miller's study is finely nuanced, however, and he does not oversimplify the situation. He notes that ancient near eastern laws (including OT laws) consistently stipulate punishments which will "fit" the crimes in some sense, and then analyzes this appropriateness or correspondence into three different categories. He is then able to observe that the prophetic judgments can be analyzed in the same way - a fact which in itself tends to support his general thesis and to rebut Koch's arguments.

The reviewer finds Miller's thesis convincing and his exegesis of individual passages illuminating, especially where a study of the nature of the correlation between sin and punishment helps to solve exegetical or textual problems. Miller could have strengthened his own case by indicating the weakness of some of Koch's linguistic reasoning; in particular, it is very dubious semantic procedure to deduce from the twofold meaning of ra and similar words that sin and its consequences (to use a neutral term) are part of an indivisible whole. The fact that a single word can denote both sin

and judgment is a very fragile basis for a theological edifice; and a semantic phenomenon, it differs little from a word like ḥaṭṭa't, which embraces both "sin" and "sin-offering". Plainly a sin-offering is no automatic and inevitable consequence of sin; it is rather the subsequent action which the individual human being may consider to be appropriate to the situation created by the sin. Similarly, "evil" (i.e. calamity) may be envisaged as the subsequent action determined by God to be the appropriate response to the "evil" (i.e. moral wrong) perpetrated by a man. The linguistic phenomenon in no way rules out a retributive concept.

It is a pity there is no index of biblical references (nor any other index, for that matter)

Queen's University,
Belfast

D.F. Payne

Fernando F. Segovia, Love Relationships in the Johannine Tradition,
Scholars Press, Chico, 1982 pp xiii + 319 pp

This dissertation approaches the theme of agape (love) in 1 John and the Fourth Gospel from a particular point of view. It sets out to show not only that a theologically different notion of agape is found in 1 John when compared with its counterpart in the gospel, but also that certain texts about this theme (Jn 15.1-17; 13.34-35) were inserted into their present context in the gospel by someone whose life-situation was the same as that of 1 John.

First of all, a redaction critical study of the terms agape/agapan in 1 John discloses four basic relationships of love: the love of God for his disciples, the love of Jesus for disciples, the love of disciples for God and the love of disciples for one another. The situation in life suggested for the letter as a whole as well as for the statements about love is an internal conflict with a docetic-libertine type of Christianity which has upset and is upsetting the johannine community. These opponents proclaim a direct love of God that is, a love which bypasses entirely God's love for humanity in the form of the mission of his Son and of the redemptive death of Jesus (1 John 4.10, 19-21). The mode of love proclaimed by the author is related to the redemptive death of Jesus and would be counteracting a docetist view. Also, these opponents do not keep the commandment of Jesus (2.4) or of God (3.23; 5.3). Rather they practise a libertine behaviour which includes among other things immorality, greed or lust, self-boasting and they refuse to help a brother in need. They live a life of sin and lawlessness.

Turning to the Farewell Discourse in the Fourth Gospel, the author

from a very thorough redaction critical study of some texts (e.g. 15.1-17; 13.34-35), concludes there is a life-situation which parallels or duplicates that of 1 John. Similarities in structure, background, terminology and theology with 1 John indicate that these texts reflect a struggle within the community about a false christology (the denial of Jesus' redemptive death as Christ and Son of God) and about a failure to observe the commands of Jesus which is rooted in a libertine understanding of Christian ethics and behaviour.

In contrast, other texts about agape in the Fourth Gospel show a different theology of love and also a different community situation. Love for Jesus is defined as belief in Jesus' origin and identity (e.g. 14.21,23-24; 16.27). Both the love of the Father for the disciples and the love of Jesus for the disciples are described as a post-resurrectional activity rather than a particular event or series of events in human history before the resurrection of Jesus (e.g. 14.21,23; 16.27; 17.23). Besides, the love of the Father for Jesus is not mentioned in 1 John; it is barely touched on in John 15.1-17. On the other hand, it is an important theme in the gospel elsewhere (e.g. 3.35; 5.20; 10.17). All those texts about love in the Fourth Gospel outside John 15.1-17 and 13.34-35 are best understood against a general framework of rejection and persecution by the Jews of the synagogue (cf. 5.42; 8.42). The conclusion drawn by the author is that the relationships of love in 1 John and John 15.1-17, and 13.34-35 are presented as historical events (a perspective quite different from that in the other texts about love in the gospel) and reflect an intra-church conflict situation. The author of 1 John or someone who shared his exact situation of conflict within the community, incorporates 15.1-17 and 13.34f into the gospel against the secessionists of the johannine community.

The whole study points to that conclusion in a very well-ordered fashion. It ends with some questions about the sectarian nature of the johannine community and some contemporary views about the extent of the redaction of the Fourth Gospel by the author of 1 John (G. Richter, H. Thyen). The work merits special praise for its thoroughness and clarity. It gives a lucid account of recent discussions about the johannine community and the relationship of 1 John to the Fourth Gospel until 1977 (R.E. Brown's well-known study in this area, "The Community of the Beloved Disciples", was published in 1979). The redaction critical method is applied with delicate and rigorous finesse. There is a wealth of helpful and up-to-date information about the johannine writings in the main text and especially in the notes (pp 221-309).

The view that the author of 1 John (or someone whose life-situation was the same as 1 John) was a redactor of the Fourth Gospel, particularly of the Farewell Discourse, is sustained by some scholars. There are many similarities between the Fourth Gospel (especially in chs 15-17) and 1 John. But these may be partially explained by the situation envisaged, for the letter addressed to believers would have greater similarity to that part of the gospel where Jesus speaks to his believing followers than it would have to the first half of the

gospel where Jesus frequently addresses hostile unbelievers. It is questionable whether the imagery of the vine and the branches refers to a situation of internal conflict. It makes the direct adherence of the believers to Jesus the only criterion of bearing fruit. On the other hand, 1 John 1.3 makes communion with the "we" of the tradition a necessary intermediary for communion with the Father and Jesus. Also, does the command to love which is linked with the death of Jesus in 15.12-17 and 13.34-35 envisage necessarily an internal community conflict and is it really directed against "a docetic understanding of Jesus as the Christ and Son of God" and "against a libertine type of behaviour, apparently characterized by a bypassing of Jesus' commands" (p121) ?

Certainly this command in 1 John (3.11,23; 4.7,11) refers to internal divisions. Most likely, the command to love "one another" or "the brothers" refers to those members of the johannine community who were in communion with the author and his fellow witnesses to the tradition and who accepted his interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (cf. 1 John 1.4-5). The secessionists had left and were no longer "brothers". Their very leaving showed their lack of love and so their failure to love the author's adherents in his eyes was a failure to love the only brethren or children of God he recognized in his own community.

But in the Fourth Gospel we can interpret the call to love after the example of Jesus' self-giving in death as the hallmark of the Christian community over against those outside such as the Jews of the synagogue (cf. 15.18). Besides, one of the reasons given for the command to love in John 13.34-35 being an addition of the redactor speaking to a situation of internal conflict is that these verses "clearly interrupt the progression of thought. Their own thematic concern is quite removed from that of its context" (p122). The redaction critical method however carefully applied by the author tends here to bypass the fundamental unity of the text as it stands in our final edition of the gospel. It may be equally claimed that the command to love in 13.34-35 does not so clearly interrupt the progression of thought and that it is not so clearly removed from that of its context. There is a close connection with what precedes (13.31-33). Since Jesus is on his way to the Father, he will not be with his disciples much longer (v33). But even if he departs and they cannot "follow" him, still they can be "followers" of Jesus and they can keep his spirit alive among themselves through the command he gives them as they continue their life in the world (vv34-35 and cf. vv15-16). Indeed, as long as Christian love is in the world, the world still encounters Jesus and thus living out his new commandment is a response given in view of Jesus' physical departure by those who wish to continue his love and his presence in the world. In addition, the command to love is closely related in several ways to the wider context (13.1-30), particularly to the footwashing scene and its explanation. "I have given you an example that you also should do as I have done to you" (13.15). The similarity between these words and the "new commandment" (v34) shows that the love and self-giving service which were typical of

his life, especially of his death, and which are symbolized in the foot-washing, are to be the measure of the disciples' service in mutual humility and love.

In general, it seems possible to interpret such texts of the gospel as 15.1-17 and 13.34-35 in the light of the situation of conflict with the synagogue and alienation from the "world" outside without bringing in an internal conflict situation from 1 John. This letter reflects a later community situation of conflict when the opposing parties appealed to the traditions of the Fourth Gospel which now find a new application for the author. Probably the least one may conclude is that, if John 15.1-17 and 13.34-35 and 1 John were written by the same man, they were written at very different stages in his life and that these gospel texts (and perhaps all chs. 15-17) were written before the secession had occurred in the Johannine community.

It is extremely difficult to conclude from 1 John what were the views of the opponents criticized by the author. However, to call them "Docetist" or "libertine" (p78) is controvertible. If "Docetist" is taken in a very broad sense to express a denial of the saving importance of the flesh and death of Jesus (cf. 1 John 5.6) and not a denial of the reality of Jesus' humanity (its usual meaning) then it probably describes accurately the views of the secessionists about Jesus. Also there are indications that these were not "libertines" for they claimed to be in communion with God, to know and love him and to be begotten by him. There is no suggestion they were conscious of leading an immoral life. They could be indifferentists who attributed no saving importance to moral behaviour by believers. They may have claimed intimacy with God on the basis of their "knowing" him without emphasis on behaviour. Despite his disagreement with their ethical positions, the author never mentions explicitly any specific vices of theirs and this at a time when lists of vices and condemnations of libertinism are common enough in Christian writings (e.g. 2 Peter 2.13-14; Gal 5.19-21). However, the author is severe against their theory because ultimately such theory will be translated into practice.

Although some of the views expressed by the author are controvertible, this does not detract from the high quality of his work. In fact, it probably adds to it. The issues he tackles are difficult and they have come prominently into the foreground in recent Johannine scholarship. Anyone interested in the questions about the stages in the history in the Johannine community and the relationship between the Fourth Gospel and 1 John will find this book worthwhile and helpful reading.

Hilltown Park,
Dublin

J.S. McPolin, S.J.

Jane Schaberg, The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit: The Triadic Phrase in Matthew 28.19b

Scholars Press, Chico 1982 pp367 \$18 pb

Because of a personal fascination with the idea of the Trinity and because biblical texts which lie behind the dogma have not yet (in her opinion) received adequate critical treatment, Ms Jane Schaberg offers an exhaustive study of the triadic phrase "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" (Matt 28.19b) in an attempt to understand the "original metaphor" at the biblical source of trinitarian doctrine.

Among her conclusions are (i) the words "in the name of..." refer to the baptismal rite and may indicate that the three names (Father, Son, Spirit) are invoked by the baptizer or baptized. The singular form "name" does not imply that God is perceived as a unity of three equal persons, nor is it evidence of an analysis of inter-relationships: it cannot therefore be used as evidence that the phrase is a Trinitarian statement in the usual sense of that word. (ii) The triadic phrase is neither a post-Matthaeian interpolation nor a piece of Matthaean composition (Kingsbury), but an element of pre-Matthaean tradition embedded in a unit of post-resurrectional material (so also G. Strecker and J.P. Meier). (iii) Matt 28.19b, like some other NT triadic texts (John 3.34-5; Luke 10.21-2) developed out of an originally apocalyptic triad (thus Lohmeyer and R.H. Fuller), found in the Similitudes of Enoch (1 Enoch 37-71) as angels (or: the host of God), the Elect One and the Lord of Spirits, but earlier and more significantly in Daniel 7 as Ancient of Days, one like a son of man, and angels. "It is within the stream of interpretative traditions flowing from Dan 7 that the particular tradition or traditions which will elucidate the roots and meaning of the triad in Matt 28.19b may be discovered"(p56). (iv) The methods of midrash criticism or comparative midrash (J.A. Sanders) offer new perspectives on the origin and meaning of the Matthaean triadic phrase, and also of other exegetical problems in vss16-20. Proceeding thus, the author devotes a chapter to establishing firmly the presence of an allusion to Dan 7.14 LXX in Matt 28.19b, while taking account of the differences between the two texts and their contexts. Then she examines in detail Dan 7 and finds that the chapter uses mythological patterns and motifs and is influenced, literally and theologically, by Ezekiel 1 (via 1 Enoch 14) - the classical OT text which sparked off mystical speculation and provided generations with an image of God enthroned on the "living beings". Furthermore, since Dan 2 is midrash-ized in Dan 7, the mountain spoken of in the former may bear some relation to the mountain of Matt 28.16, and the relationship between "one like unto a son of man" (who represents Israel in its fellowship with the angels and whose humanity is therefore ambiguous) and the maskilim of Dan 11-12 may in some way lie behind the presence in Matthew's final pericope of the risen Christ who commands his disciples to teach what he has taught. Next, she examines selected inter-

testamental uses of Daniel 7 - in particular, 1 Enoch 71 (considered an original part of the book) and 4 Ezra 10-12,13 - and discovers elements in them which are relevant to the solution of exegetical problems in Matt 28.16-20. These are exaltation and its consequences, the mountain, the throne-theophany commission form, and the Enochian triad of Head of Days, righteous Son of Man (Enoch) and the angels of the heavenly court. On the basis of this search Ms Schaberg regards the end of Matthew as "a (throne-) theophany commission". Then she turns to the NT and to texts which reflect Daniel 7 and help us to understand Matt 28. 16-20. Among these are the exaltation in Revelation 2,5 and 7; the giving of power to the Son of Man (John 5. 2-27); the Son of Man at the right hand of power coming with the clouds of heaven (Mark 14.62; Matt 26.64; Luke 22.69); the Son of Man bearing witness in the heavenly court (Acts 7.55-56); a commission associated with a "theophany" of the Son of Man (Rev 1.4-5; Acts 1; Mark 13.10) and, lastly, NT triads (the Father, Son, angels).

) The last chapter sets out the traditional pre-Matthaean midrash which supplies to vss16-20 the mountain, the triad, the idea of the risen Jesus as the one assumed into heaven, the commissioning (of the seven) to teach. To this Matthew has added v17 which reflects his understanding of the tension inherent in discipleship, and 20a which reflects his interest in the binding and freeing nature of the law as interpreted by Jesus. (V18, the words "all nations" in v19 and "the close of days" are drawn from Dan 4.14 and 12.14 LXX). I include my description of the book's main arguments with three short quotations:

"The triadic phrase in the context of the midrash is shorthand for the eschatological theophany, or the event of exaltation" (p327).

"The triadic phrase.....stands as a statement of belief that death has been transcended in the case of Jesus of Nazareth who, like Enoch, has been assumed. As part of the baptismal command, the triadic phrase is also a statement of hope in the ultimate vindication of authentic Israel, of all drawn into participation in this event of exaltation." (p327)

"There is not sufficient evidence to indicate that the triadic phrase, either at the midrashic or at the Matthaean redactional stage, is trinitarian. But two aspects of the thought world out of which it originates could impel toward trinitarian thinking: (a) the assimilation of angels and Holy Spirit, of the "personal" beings of the heavenly court and the impersonal power of the divine; (b) the image of the human yet heavenly figure now permanently in the divine council." (pp336-7)

This is a work of wide-ranging, fundamental scholarship. It is thorough and illuminating. It offers many insights and leads to deep questions, not the least of which concerns the Christian use of merkabah imagery and mystical tradition. To some it may seem fanciful, and to those who think of the triadic phrase as Matthaean

composition unnecessary, but to all it cannot be anything but provocatively interesting. The book was originally a doctrinal dissertation. Both the text and the notes should have been pruned considerably before it was published as a book. Then the thesis would have avoided repetition, become clearer and more readily accessible, without any loss of conviction. All in all, a book for scholars only, but I hope that notice will be taken of it by those who reflect on the doctrine of the Trinity and its origins. Alas, I think that is a forlorn hope!

The University,
Sheffield

David Hill.

B.H. Brinsmead, Galatians - Dialogical Response to Opponents

Scholars Press, Chico 1982 pp xv + 366 np

The thesis here is that Paul, in writing Galatians, follows a Greek literary genre, that of the "apologetic letter". In this Dr. Brinsmead owes a great deal to Hans Dieter Betz, in his article entitled "The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians", the first to claim such a literary genre. Dr Betz said of the "apologetic letter" that it "presupposes the real or fictitious situation of a court of law with the jury, the accuser and the defendant". (NTS, 1975, pp 341-352 espec.377). Thus in Galatians the addressees are the jury, Paul the defendant and his opponents the accusers. Later, in his commentary on Galatians, (Galatians 1979, Fortress Press) Dr Betz made this structure of the "apologetic letter" that on which he build his commentary. It divides up into seven parts: 1. Epistolary Prescript (1.1-5); 2. Exordium (1.6-11); 3. Narratio (1.12-2.14); 4. Propositio (2.15-21); 5. Probatio (3.1-4.31); 6. Exhortatio (5.1-6.10); 7. Epistolary Postscript (6.11-18). This structure with few variations is that followed by Brinsmead, and is not remarkable if both agree on the explanation of an "apologetic genre".

It would not be surprising if the first reaction of many to this thesis would be one of frank unbelief, not necessarily to the view that Paul is on the defensive in Galatians (e.g. on the matter of his apostleship and of his gospel), but to the contention that he carefully structured this epistle. The usual explanation for his omission, for example, of the thanksgiving from Galatians is often given as his displeasure with the fickleness of the Galatians and their readiness to judaize the gospel, by permitting circumcision. Paul uses language which does show he is angry and deeply disturbed. A matter of vital concern to him is at stake and stirs up all his emotions. In this atmosphere, it will hardly make sense to many when Brinsmead writes: "In terms of the rhetorical model, the explanation is simple: Paul

...ing a particular kind of proemium or exordium in conformity with the nature of a certain type of situation." (p48) Thus Paul leaves the thanksgiving. How convincing is this? And how important a structure for any of Paul's letters which even Brinsmead admits very diverse indeed? (p38)

It would have been more convincing if an "apologetic genre" could be produced from the secular literature of the time but, as far as we be ascertained, we have not a single instance of an apologetic letter with which to compare Galatians (cf the perceptive and pathetic review of Wayne A. Meeks, JBL, Vol 100.2, June 1981, 14-307). Indeed all we have from Betz and Brinsmead are series of rhetorical or epistolary form and not real apologies or letters. In a situation like this it is hard to avoid a special kind of pleading or even reading into Galatians what we seek to find. It gives rise to strenuous efforts to substantiate what appears to be a precarious hypothesis and the net result is obscure rather than shed light on Galatians.

But if we say this, it does not call into question the sustained ability or thoroughness of Brinsmead's work in pursuit of validating a premiss as evident in his review of the relevant literature (9-36) the painstaking and suggestive notation (203-349). It is doubtful, however, whether the view of Galatians as a carefully articulated apologetic genre will ever survive as more than a curiosity of NT scholarship.

...on Theological College,
East BT7 1JT

E.A. Russell

Karl Rahner, Concern for the Church, Volume 20, Theological Investigations

Darton, Longman & Todd 1981, pp vi + 191 £14.50

Karl Rahner, the eminent German Roman Catholic theologian, continues his prolific writing in essay form in this volume. In contrast to many previous works which were hard to grasp and were both theological and philosophical, here we have a volume at once pastoral and theological but more readable and comprehensible. It deals with several important issues of our time. "Concern for the Church" is, indeed, an apt sub-title. Rahner is concerned for the Roman Catholic Church in the present and its hopes and dreams for the future. From the thirteen essays one can only select several topical areas on which to comment.

On the 15th October 1976 the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in Rome published a statement on the question of women and the priesthood. It appealed to a universal tradition excluding women from such office and to the practice of Jesus in choosing male apostles only, while at the same time recognizing that both Jesus and his disciples rose above the current attitude to women. This

in fact means an exclusion for all time and all sociological conditions - an exclusion which has a normative character.

Rahner, while accepting the weight of authority behind this view, does not accept it uncritically. He does so for two main reasons: (a) that even this imposing authority in Rome may represent a "human", not a "divine", tradition; (b) the arguments set out in favour are neither theologically nor practically cogent. In particular, sociological and cultural reasons may have entered into Jesus' decisions; the transfer of what happened to the twelve to the later priesthood is illegitimate. Moreover, the priestly ministry is too tied to sacramental celebration and takes too little account of preaching. In fact, Rahner seems to question the priority of sacramental life in the early Church - a position which, if followed out, would have far-reaching consequences for the eucharistic sacrifice of the mass. He rejects also the mere fact of Jesus being a male as definitive and the "order of creation" argument and is in favour of a position which recognizes the equal rights and equal dignity of women.

Yet he does not simply support women priests now, in clear opposition to his Church. He does, however, point in this direction but feels that the debate must continue - a consensus only being possible in the church when women in both Church and State can be freed from the many forms of discrimination still practised against them.

If this is one task set the Roman Catholic Church practically and theologically another is to continue to assess the abiding significance of Vatican 2. Rahner sees this as embodied in five aspects: 1. the Roman Catholic Church emerged at Vatican 2 as a world church with various liturgies and the use of the vernacular; 2. in contrast to previous attitudes it was called upon to renounce power to impose its will on the world as is the case in some Islamic states (and, sadly, still too true in Irish Roman Catholicism); 3. theology at the Council was less neo-scholastic and more biblical and ecumenically orientated; 4. the Roman Catholic Church now no longer regards other Christians as heretics and non-Christians as pagans but adopts a different, more Christian attitude to both; 5. in contrast to the pessimism of Augustinianism where the teaching of a massa damnata seems to consign most people to hell, Vatican 2 gave a more optimistic view where grace has a thrust to include all. Roman Catholicism does not teach universalism but now has a strong tendency in that direction.

One can see here not simply Roman Catholic teaching but Rahner's own views on what he calls "anonymous" Christianity. Rahner sees the emphasis of Vatican 2 as not yet actualized in his church. It is therefore something that has to be achieved and a task actively to be pursued in the spirit and under the impact of the Council.

Rahner is a committed ecumenist but of a special Roman Catholic

.. He sees clearly that the will of Christ for his church is unity and that division is, and always will, remain an offence. He believes, however, that one approaches one's task of reunion by use of "hierarchy of truths" of Vatican 2. This means acknowledging basic unity of the faith in various churches and seeing other aspects in relation to this either as further away or closer to the centre. With the exception of the papacy are we not really one? He asks. He believes that Roman Catholics should interpret the faith in a way more acceptable to Protestants and that their authorities should take more practical steps to eliminate objectionable features and to set more acceptable limits to the primacy of the papacy. Then we can both retain the real substance of Vatican 2 and accommodate the evangelical freedom of Protestants in a united church at the same time.

Rahner has a dream for the church, namely, that papal primacy and infallibility should be seen to propound no new revelation. When the pope speaks *ex cathedra* he should rather listen to the voice of the whole Christian community (including the separated brethren) and then make his decisions. Secondly, the papacy should concentrate on the essential substance of the faith already shared. The pope will still be needed as leader - why seek a new leader when one is there already? Other churches would be asked to accept union on these terms.

But could they conscientiously do so? It is not the substance of the faith that necessarily divides but the actual claims of the pope for the church to infallibility that is one of the main stumbling blocks. It is not new revelations that one fears but additions to, and different interpretations of, the one revelation already given. However the substance of the gospel acts as a critique not only of our forms but, in particular, of that form exercised (however vernacularized and adapted) by the Roman Catholic church in its claims.

Rahner goes to the limits to be an eirenic ecumenist. In so doing, he comes close to stepping beyond what is legitimately Roman Catholic. Even this is essentially an offer to unite with a Reformed Roman Catholicism while retaining its basic dogmas. It is precisely these at least that are unacceptable and continue to provide the stumbling block. While the desire for a future, renewed church is admirable, the form Rahner proposes is unlikely to commend itself to many outside the Roman Catholic church and indeed to not a few within it.

Ston Theological College
Belfast BT7 1JT

John Thompson

History of Congregations in the Presbyterian Church in Ireland

1900-1982 Presbyterian Historical Society of Ireland, Belfast
1982 pp vi + 808

Since the publication of this work in September 1982 I have been

browsing regularly in its pages and I have come across many items, old and new, which have refreshed my memories of the Irish Presbyterian Church. During my fifteen years in the ministry in Ireland I rarely preached outside the Banbridge Presbytery and so I had few personal links with the congregations of the Church but many ministers were and are known to me and it has been a pleasure to come across their names on these pages. Some who were my college contemporaries have already completed their earthly life. Most of the others have already retired or are about to retire and it is good to be able to find that so many have had long and varied ministries, some becoming leaders of the Church, others confining themselves largely to their own congregations.

There were many others whom I did not know but who were my father's generation and whose names were familiar from my childhood, and there were others who were the venerable figures whom he often recalled from his early days. It has been fascinating to come across all these names again. It is also moving to find myself generously remembered and even more so to read the succinct estimate that my father had "a long and faithful ministry of the best type."

In attempting to give a more general estimate of the work, tribute must be paid to the industry of its compilers, and particularly of Dr. John T. Carson who not only had a major share in collecting and collating the material but also had a major share in seeing the work through the press.

The first feature which is brought home to the reader is that the Church has been a church covering the whole of Ireland. The courage of pioneers in remote parts of Ireland and the perseverance of groups of Presbyterians in the face of famine, violence, emigration and political unrest has been remarkable.

The second has been the way the Church has had to come through fresh challenges. There were the early settlers in the seventeenth century who strove to plant Presbyterian congregations, and the reader is reminded of this in the records of churches in Bangor, Ballywalter, Killinchy, Killyleagh and many more. There were troubled times in the eighteenth century and these are reflected in notes about ministers who were associated with the United Irishmen. The stirring times of the '59 Revival in the nineteenth century are recalled in the accounts of congregations in the Ballymena area. The trials of two world wars in the twentieth century are recalled as the reader comes across the names of ministers who served as chaplains to the Forces. The massive shift of population in this century also called forth a praiseworthy Church Extension movement and this is reflected in the entries about many new congregations.

The third feature to be noted is the vast variety of people who have entered the ministry. There have been the ecclesiastical statesmen: Henry Cooke who must have preached at the opening of as many churches in Ireland as he did in England; William Park of Rosemary Street; W.J. Lowe, a prince among Clerks of Assembly; and John Waddell, a

of debate, often exasperating but usually right. There have been the scholars, Killen, Witherow, Paul and Barkley; the greatest of them all, J. Ernest Davey, was never a minister in a congregation but only comes into the record as his father's son. There have been the outstanding preachers; these are too numerous to name and vary according to personal taste, but from my youth I recall the then highly regarded such as Pyper, Sproule and Blue, and their ministry is revived in these pages. There were also those who devoted their whole ministry to one congregation and cut no figure in the General Assembly but they were the backbone of the Church's ministry. There were also the wits, the eccentrics and the characters who made the ministry a varied and magnetic facet of community life.

A fourth feature probably worthy of note is the number of ministers who entered the ministry. The phenomenal number of eight Corkeys; four Youngs and three Parks; there have been quite a few manse families of which two have gone into the ministry, notable among these being the Gorells who were descended from a family of French Protestants who had many pastors within it and which also provided several ministers for Independent Churches in Essex. If my reading of the book is correct it would seem that for better or worse the son of the minister has become an endangered species in the Irish Church's ministry.

A fifth point to note is the number of ministers who have gone to other Churches, in America, in the Commonwealth and in the Presbyterian Church of England. Members of the Irish churches have enriched the life of other Churches. When I came across the name of Robert Murray McCheyne Gilmour of Wellington Street, Ballymena, I was reminded that I had met his son in Harlow New Town where he had been the leading planner of the new city and a pillar of the new Presbyterian Church to which he had given a hall over the door of which was the statement that it was a hall given in memory of Robert Murray McCheyne Gilmour by his son.

There is an immense harvest of memory and information to be gleaned from this book.

Are there any weaknesses in the volume?

There are some minor errors of fact. Two sons of Rev J.D. Martin were accidentally killed in World War 2, not World War 1. I have noticed a few more slips but, as the compilers say, in a work with over 1000 facts these are almost inevitable and of trifling import.

It may be argued that the work is a history of ministers rather than of congregations and that the continuity of congregational life could be more truly seen in the work of the elders and of church members. I can recall elders in the Banbridge Presbytery who left their mark upon its life and who spanned the comings and goings of ministers. However, as the compilers knew only too well, any attempt to cover this ground would require several volumes and a load of research beyond their resources.

It may also be argued that it would have been better to arrange the churches into Presbyteries. Presbyteries had, and I suppose still

have, distinctive features. The congregations of the Route Presbytery had a family resemblance. When the Banbridge Presbytery had members of the calibre of Reid, Knowles, Moore and Anderson, it had a quality all its own. Moreover, the gathering of all the Belfast congregations under one section enabled me to grasp much more easily the ebb and flow and shifts of population in the city and the consequent impact on the Church. However, once again this would have proved impracticable in view of the changes in presbytery boundaries. Neither Banbridge nor Rathfriland Presbyteries now exist, and a classification under Iveagh would not convey the flavour of either.

A further suggestion for improvement might be the provision of an Index. I had not felt the need of this myself as I still have a grasp of the ways of the Church and I had no difficulty in finding any name I wanted, but I have met several visitors to our College Library who examined the book and were unable to trace Irish ministers whom they had met as chaplains to the Forces or as ministers for a time in England, or on church deputations. An Index would have helped them, but the covering of tens of thousands of entries would have been editorially exhausting and financially crippling.

Therefore, taking the work as a whole, the compilers have accomplished a mammoth enterprise which will be indispensable to future historians and which will continue to give enjoyment and encouragement to the present generation of readers.

Westminster College,
Cambridge

R. Buick Knox.